

805
L322
V.2
no.1

PRR

Language Learning

A Quarterly Journal of Applied Linguistics

VOLUME II, NUMBER 1

JANUARY-MARCH, 1949

CONTENTS

Editorial	1
Meanings, Habits and Rules..... <i>W. F. Twaddell</i>	4
Do I Do That?..... <i>Virginia French</i>	12
Approaching Reading Through the Native Language..... <i>Eugene A. Nida</i>	16
Controlled Infant Intonation..... <i>Evelyn G. Pike</i>	21
Whither the Desk Dictionary?..... <i>Albert H. Marckwardt</i>	25

DEPARTMENTS

REVIEWS	29
ANNOUNCEMENTS AND NOTES.....	33
READERS' EXCHANGE	34

Ch.
Geo.
John
8.
Sh

C.L.
Decl.
Johnston
8-5-59
Shustage

805
L322

LANGUAGE LEARNING

A Quarterly Journal of Applied Linguistics

Volume II, Number 1

January-March, 1949

CONTENTS

Editorial.....	1
Meanings, Habits and Rules..... <i>W.F. Twaddell</i>	4
Do I Do That?..... <i>Virginia French</i>	12
Approaching Reading Through the Native Language ... <i>Eugene A. Nida</i>	16
Controlled Infant Intonation..... <i>Evelyn G. Pike</i>	21
Whither the Desk Dictionary?..... <i>Albert H. Marckwardt</i>	25

DEPARTMENTS

Reviews.....	29
Announcements and Notes.....	33
Readers' Exchange.....	35

LANGUAGE LEARNING

A Quarterly Journal of Applied Linguistics

EDITORIAL ADVISERS

Charles C. Fries.....	University of Michigan
Kenneth L. Pike.....	University of Michigan
	Summer Institute of Linguistics
W. Freeman Twaddell.....	Brown University

Volume II, Number 1

January - March 1949

STAFF

Robert Lado.....	Editor for this issue
Betty Jane Wallace.....	Business Manager
Edward M. Anthony.....	Reviews
Maxine Guin.....	Notes and Announcements
Warren Yates.....	Readers' Exchange
Gerald Dykstra.....	Make-up and Proof
Richard Andrade.....	Advertising
Ann Anthony, Robert Brower, James W. Downer, Harold King, Yao Shen, Roy Strozzi.....	Staff

REPRESENTATIVES

Alva L. Davis Western Reserve University Cleveland, Ohio	Harry Josselson Wayne University Detroit, Michigan
Charles Michalski c/o U. S. Embassy Lima, Peru	David W. Reed University of California Berkeley, California
Everett Kleinjans Kulangsu, Amoy China	Lloyd B. Swift National College of Recon- struction Pa-Hsien, Szechuan, China

EDITORIAL

MAINTAINING INTEREST

In the effort to make the learning of a foreign language interesting it is often assumed that the task in itself is dull and may be made palatable only by extraneous means such as stories, games, and the like. This assumption overlooks the fact that most students, once they find themselves in a foreign language class, show an initial interest in using the language rather than mastering the stories and other extraneous stimuli. The problem is how to maintain and strengthen that initial interest. We shall comment on three means of attack based on intrinsic interest in the language itself: (1) oral work, (2) graded, attainable goals, and (3) attitudes.

Oral work. Linguists have unmistakably advocated oral work in learning a foreign language. Works by Henry Sweet¹, Otto Jespersen², Leonard Bloomfield³, and Charles C. Fries⁴ present linguistic views that we cannot afford to overlook. The emphasis on oral mastery in the Army courses, devised by linguists, is well known. Finally it is not difficult to detect an increasingly greater emphasis on pronunciation--which is oral work--even in the materials of those who advocate reading as the primary aim in foreign language learning. It is also interesting to note that the "reading readiness" of our primary and pre-primary grades is nothing but oral preparation for reading.

Oral work is reemphasized here for its intrinsic value in arousing and maintaining interest on the part of the student. There is some recent experimental evidence⁵

¹Henry Sweet, The Practical Study of Languages. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1899.

²Otto Jespersen, How to Teach a Foreign Language. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1904.

³Leonard Bloomfield, Outline Guide for the Practical Study of Foreign Languages. Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America, 16 pp., 1942.

⁴Charles C. Fries, Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1945. I am also indebted to Charles C. Fries for the references given under footnote numbers 1, 2, 3, and 5.

⁵E. B. de Sauze, "The Cleveland Plan or The Multiple Approach in Language Teaching," The Quarterly Language Research Bulletin, Vol. I, No. 3. October, 1948.

that supports this view propounded by the scientists and so often rediscovered by good teachers of foreign languages.

Graded, attainable goals. Interest will be maintained if the materials and the teaching are so organized that the student is attempting to reach one goal after another, each of which is difficult enough to constitute a challenge and easy enough to be attainable. The effective use of the patterns in the structure of English constitutes a series of challenges and attainable goals. Overcoming pronunciation difficulties constitutes a series of goals that if properly organized and graded will challenge the student to continuous effort. And of course learning vocabulary is a challenge, too. Lack of accurate linguistic description of a language sometimes makes it difficult to grade the materials to be mastered, and as a result the student may either become discouraged because the goals are beyond his reach or he may be bored because there is no challenge at all in what he is being "taught". The answer to this problem has too often been to try to find interests outside the language, itself. A better answer, however, is to use a linguistically accurate description of the language, and its difficulties as compared with the native language, and to arrange those difficulties in a series of attainable goals. The teaching itself needs to emphasize the student's own attempt to attain each goal. This may be done by demonstrating each point and letting the student know when he is being successful and when he is not. Interest will be maintained as long as the student knows what the goal is, as long as he is trying to reach it, and as long as he is kept informed immediately after each try whether or not he has succeeded.

Attitudes. A student's attitude toward a class depends largely upon what the class is doing and will do for him.⁶ When the emphasis is on grades the attitudes of the students are likely to be negative since only a few will ever attain the coveted A. If the course has nothing but a grade to offer, the majority of students will feel--whether distinctly or not--that here is another semester of hard work just to prove once more that Bill and John and Dorothy are the smartest ones in the class and that he is either lazy or dull or both. Fear of failure--a negative stimulus--is all that remains.

⁶For an interesting recent study see Asahel D. Woodruff and Francis J. DiVesta, "The Relationship Between Values, Concepts, and Attitudes," Educational and Psychological Measurement, Vol. VIII, No. 4, winter, 1948, pp. 645-659.

Yet if the students felt that in the language class they were really gaining control over a new language, if they found that they could use the language in more and more situations as they mastered its system, their attitudes would improve and, as a result, their interest in the language itself would be maintained.

R. L.

MEANINGS, HABITS and RULES¹

W. F. Twaddell

Brown University

We are analysts and teachers of that odd human practice known as language. Whether we are working with grammar or literature, we are working with and through language. It is our business whenever one human being affects another by disturbing the molecules of the air or defacing some surface with marks.

This business of ours puts us at the ringside of an intricate and fascinating social activity. Language is one of the points of intersection in that network of habit and choice which is the pattern of our human doings. Nowhere, probably, do we human beings act with quite so intimate a fusing of habits and choices as when we talk and listen, write and read.

In a sense, we can say what we choose: we can talk about the weather, or Aunt Susie's operation, or the scandalous behavior of Mrs. Applethwacker, or little Oswald's last test, or--so it seems to us--we can talk about anything else. Within the limits of propriety and discretion and the patience of our listeners we have complete freedom of choice to talk about anything we please, and to say what we please about it. But if we're talking American English, we are absolutely certain to do that talking in certain sentence types, making certain kinds of noises and no others, using certain combinations of those noises and no others.

We may choose to call Mrs. Applethwacker a hussy; we cannot choose to call her a *huà-y-rén*. If we were talking Mandarin Chinese, we could choose to call her a *huà-y-rén*, but we should neither be tempted nor be able to call her a hussy. Nor can we choose to tell the world that "Mrs. Applethwacker a hussy is." Nor can we choose to call Mrs. A. a "hoozie" or a "hassy." In sum, we can say what we please, but we have to talk in a particular way. There is an element of choice in language which we call meaning; that is an expression of the individual personality. But there is also an element of compulsion in language: that is the habitual aspect, which is predictable, which is below and above the control of the individual: it is a rule of the language.

In the practical affairs of social life, this habitual aspect of language is as much a matter of course as the air we breathe. The native speakers of a language talk and write in accordance with the rules of their language simply because that's the way they talk and

¹A talk given before the New England Modern Language Association on May 8, 1948, in Providence, Rhode Island. (Reprinted from "EDUCATION" for October, 1948)

write. They don't choose or invent a structure of pronunciation because they want to sound musical; they don't choose or invent a grammatical system because they want to talk logically; they don't choose or invent a repertory of words.

By the time we have learned to talk English, we don't have to think about using different pronunciations of *t* in "tin" and "still"; we do it right, every time, without thinking about it. We don't have to remember to set subject before verb in the statement sentence; that's the only sequence in statement sentences. We don't have to recall that the English word for "house" is "house" rather than *maison* or *casa* or *jyā* or *dom*.

We don't for example, apply the rules describing adverbs between subject and verb: Certain general adverbs of time occur between subject and verb--"I usually take a bath on Saturday," "We never serve horseradish on ice cream," "He always blames somebody else"; but adverbs of place do not occur between subject and verb, and we don't say "I there had a good time," "We here will build a campfire," "He everywhere gets into trouble." This is a rather complicated rule of English grammar; speakers of English are largely unaware of it, but the English they speak is consistent in conforming to it.

When we talk or write a language which we command, and when we hear it or read it, we pay no attention to these habitual practices. They are habits; they are taken for granted; we have learned both to conform to them and to ignore them.

In our practical use of language, all our attention is focussed on the factor of choice. We decide whether to say "yes" or "no"; we don't worry about a monophthong in one answer and a diphthong in the other. We decide to assert that Senator Jumbo is a windbag; we don't have to plan to use the third person singular verb "is" rather than "are." When we hear that our alma mater has defeated Slippery Rock Teachers' College in basketball, we don't reflect that subjects precede verbs and deduce from that analysis which team was victorious.

All these habitual aspects of English are below the level of attention. Whenever for some reason our attention is required by such matters--an unfamiliar pronunciation, an unaccustomed combination of grammatical elements--we are distracted and usually annoyed or contemptuous. Our concern normally is meaning and meaning is a function of choice. What we pay attention to in listening and reading is the meaning, the speaker's or writer's choice of things to say.

How disturbingly different our procedure has to be in learning a new language! Here, everything attracts our attention, aspects of habit as well as aspects of meaningful choice. Precisely because we don't know the

language, we are unable to take its habitual aspects for granted. We have to learn to ignore that which is habit in the new language, just as its native speakers have had to learn to ignore it; and some day we will be able to ignore it. But our skill in using our own language blinds us to the large element of habit in it; the only things we notice in our own language are the meanings, the acts of choice.

So, whatever we notice is a meaning for us. And in the new language we notice everything, the habitual aspects as well as the aspects of choice. We notice unfamiliar sounds, and unfamiliar sequences of sounds; so we conclude that the rate of speech is extremely rapid. After we have learned to identify some individual words, we notice that the order of words is different from the habitual order in English; so we are aware of it, and therefore react as though the word order of the new language were an expression of meaning, an act of choice of some kind. We find in the new language nouns with cases, where our habits are prepositions; we find tenses and moods of verbs, where we are in the habit of using auxiliaries.

We find new word habits: the speakers of the language do not have separate word habits to correspond to a distinction between "swim" and "float"; but they have two different habits to correspond to our "know." Most perplexing of all, we find that the users of another language are addicted to idioms of a strange and alarming sort, whereas we are in the habit of just letting ourselves go and coming through with whatever we want to put across.

All these features are habits for the native users of the language, and they are as unaware of their habits as we are of the phonetic and grammatical peculiarities of English which we practice with unconscious skill. But in a foreign language we notice them; and when we notice something in language we are conditioned to assume a meaning, an act of choice.

This is incorrect, of course. And we teachers of language have learned better. We know that a speaker of French doesn't use a certain verb because he has decided to select a third person plural imperfect; he uses the verb ending because that's what you use when you're saying that particular thing in French. But our students assume that the Frenchman uses it for the same reason that the student would use it in a translation exercise: because there's a rule that requires it. The student has to make an act of choice to decide what ending to use; so he assumes that the Frenchman has to go through the same soul-searching experience.

The learner, that is, is hypersensitive to the habitual aspects of a new language; he sees meanings and choices where for the native speaker there is no meaning or choice. For the naïve learner, the foreign language represents a much greater density of meanings than his own, for he notices both real choices and also the habitual features which do not involve choice. So far as the naïve learner is concerned, the speakers of all other languages perform prodigies of split-second choosings from among intricate arrays of grammatical forms, add them to items in the dictionary, and then put the products together according to various patterns of word order. The innocent freshman naturally regards this as a hard fate--and one that calls for an explanation.

Alas, we have given him the explanation. We have told the freshman why the unhappy speaker of French or Spanish or German or Tibetan has to go to all this cruel and unusual trouble in order to talk: It is because of the rules of his language. We know what these rules are. We know that a "rule" of a language is the analytical statement of one of the habitual aspects of that language. We know that the habit is the reality and the rule is a mere summary of the habit. We know that the rule describes how people talk and not why they talk that way. But our students are not as sophisticated as we.

So far as they are concerned, they notice something. And when they notice something, they assume that the speaker or writer meant them to notice it. So they have to endow the grammatical habits of speakers of another language with some meaning. I dare say many students pity or despise the ancient Romans as people who had to be constantly on guard for or against the ablative absolute and the subjunctive; the French are people whose recollections of history are forever filtered through past definite and past indefinite; and the conversation of Germans is hampered by the necessity of deciding whether a clause is independent or subordinate, so as to know where to put the verb.

It is quite natural for our students to have these absurd ideas. Not because the students are stupid; I have tried to show that these absurd ideas are a logical consequence of a skill in speaking any language and ignorance of the processes of language. It would be pleasant, to be sure, if our students had learned something of the body of knowledge we call modern linguistics. But they are by and large as ignorant of modern linguistics as the sixteenth century peasant was ignorant of the Copernican theory. We have to take our student as we find him; and we find him predisposed to think about language in terms of rules rather than habits.

This makes our job harder; there is no doubt of that. A good many students simply find that the rules don't interest them, and the only meaning they can see in a foreign language is the rather unprofitable meaning of the disjunctive pronoun and the subjunctive verb. Without that meaning they think they can live; and they do.

We know that they are mistaken in regarding these grammatical habits as meanings; but we can't convince them. We know that the rules are only temporary substitutes for habits, and the sooner a rule is forgotten because it is absorbed and dissolved in a habit, the better. We want the student to get to the point where he can forget the rule and take the habit for granted, and give all his attention to the real meanings, to the real choices. But this takes time and practice, more time and practice probably than an Olympian curriculum committee has allotted us.

The sad result is that many of our students spend most of their language study time in this chrysalis stage, when they can't distinguish between meanings and habits, when they are still noticing unfamiliar habits and accounting for them as "rules," when they have not yet learned to ignore the habitual aspects and focus on the real meanings. It is those real meanings that we aim at; and, with the aid of Heaven and a long spoon, some of our students do get to the desired stage. But many of them don't; for *them* the study of a language is largely a study of rules--and that means that these students are not able to pay attention to the real things that are said and written in the language.

This is too bad, no doubt about it. We certainly prefer a student who can read a book to one who can only conjugate verbs. But we know that until he can take verb forms for granted he can't read the book and concentrate on the real meanings in it. This, of course, is the reason we spend so much time on the habitual aspects of a language: as a preliminary conditioning, to create the habit so as to liberate the attention for the meaningful aspects of speech and writing.

Must we then resign ourselves to working with many students who will never emerge from this preliminary phase? Of course we must, just as all teachers must. The teacher of mathematics knows that most of his students will never read a mathematical treatise after the final examination. The teacher of chemistry knows that most of his charges will never perform any experiment more intricate than mixing a cocktail. The teacher of the social studies knows that most of his students will get their data from the radio, the newspaper, and gossip.

But the fact that these students do not reach the most productive, the most rewarding phase of their various studies does not mean that those studies are wasted. All those studies leave their residues in the little gray cells, and the world has more orderliness, more of the world is in the domain of the comprehensible, more of the actions of people are explicit and describable. Less of the world is irrationally magical, less of society is overlooked or attributed to individual caprice. The pupil product of even the preliminary phases is aware rather than stolid, rather more calculating and rather less excitable.

Just so, the preliminary phase of language study, the "mere rules" phase, has a value in itself. That value may not be as great as the experience of communion with Racine, or Cervantes, or Goethe, or Lucretius, but it is still a value.

It is, among other things, the value of seeing the difference between a single language and universal reality. The price we pay for our prodigious skill in speaking our native language is that we do many things unconsciously. Those aspects of our language which are habitual are beneath our attention; they are wholly a matter of course, and it is always dangerous for anything human to be wholly a matter of course. English grammar is our way of talking, and our naïve students cannot help believing that it is *the* natural way of talking. An acquaintance with some other way of talking is salutary--solely because it is another way of talking.

Our students of course take the difference between "one" and "more than one" quite seriously; all their grammatical habits are enforcing the distinction between singular and plural, hundreds of times every day--and they don't know it. But only a minority of the human-beings now talking are so channeled by their grammars; for many people, many millions of people, the distinction between "older" and "younger" is dinned into them oftener than a distinction between "one" and "more than one." Our students partition the flow of time in a certain way, because our grammar does--and they don't know it. A different partition of time by a different grammar is salutary.

These particular details are relatively unimportant, probably, but it is not unimportant that all of our habits of talking are only one of many possible sets of habits.

The rules of grammar, as the student suspects, do have a meaning. But they are not mere un-American perversities. They are indexes of non-American habits. And if there is any one thing which Americans in the second half of the twentieth century will need to recog-

nize, it is precisely that there are *non-American habits* which are *not anti-American choices*. If we must use the jargon of the school catalogue, grammatical rules are a segment of social anthropology. Grammatical rules are our summary of a community behavior of societies; they are not the expression of the wisdom of academies, nor are they built into the structure of the universe, nor even into human nature, if there is such a thing.

Grammatical rules are likely to be the student's first introduction to cultural relativity. They should be taught as such. To be sure, the other West European languages are not ideal for this purpose; Cantonese Chinese or Eskimo would be better. But we are not only social anthropologists, we are also humanists and historians (and participants in West European culture). So we must compromise between the values of cultural relativity and the--for us--absolute values of Hebraeo-Graeco-Roman-Mediterranean-Northwest European-British-American cultural traditions.

Those cultural traditions, in the widest sense, are our major goals. The students for whom we can make those traditions accessible are the students with whom we have succeeded, just as the teacher of physics has succeeded with a student who subscribes to and reads the *Journal of the American Physical Society*. But we also have succeeded with the student who becomes in some degree more aware of how language works. In however modest degree, if one of our students begins to be aware of the habitual aspects of language, and draws some of the obvious conclusions, we have been socially useful.

For we are, I repeat, at the ringside of an intricate and fascinating social activity. Language is one of the points of intersection in that network of habit and choice which is the pattern of our human doings. Nowhere, probably, do we human beings act with quite so intimate a fusing of habits and choices as when we talk and listen, write and read.

He is a better human being who knows the difference between habit and choice. We teachers of language can probably be a bit more explicit in pointing out to our students what is so obvious to us along these lines. The study of the human activity of language can be made a constant reminder that we act as we do because we are at one and the same time members of the human race, members of a community, and individuals.

The range of possible noises that homo loquens can produce is ultimately conditioned by the structure of the human vocal apparatus and hearing apparatus. Within these physiological limitations, the usage of a community imposes further restrictions: each language, each dialect

has its phonemic structure, and only what is within that structure is possible for the speakers and listeners of the language or dialect. And, within the limits of structure imposed by the community, the individual speaker makes his choices. He who speaks and writes lives his social life along the network of his community's habits and his own choices among those habits. He sees his choices as free and he ignores the limitations. The beginning learner of a language sees that the choices are not free, and that is worth seeing. The advanced learner of a language comes to ignore the limitations and move about among them comfortably, so that the real choices become the only choices he sees. And that is a skill of great value.

'Meaning is our destination; the way to it, through rules, is a journey with its own rewards.'

DO I DO THAT?

A Suggested Check List for Teachers of English as a Second Language

Virginia French
Teachers' College, Columbia University

Few teachers of English as a second language have an opportunity to visit other teachers' classes. There is seldom the leisure to witness the trail-blazing of our colleagues: we are too busy blazing our own trails and being "observed" in the process. When one does have the rare chance of watching other members of the brotherhood in action, the experience is distinctly educational to the observer. A glimpse of the mote in the other fellow's eye sends the visitor promptly to a mirrow, where more often than not he finds a similar mote in his own.

In preparation for a revision of materials, the writer has recently enjoyed the rare opportunity of visiting several classes in English at home and abroad. All of the classes were "good" classes; all of the teachers were "good" teachers, admirably in tune with sound linguistic principles. Sitting on the students' side of the desk, however, and viewing techniques and procedures with the comfortable detachment of a spectator, the visitor has been prompted to engage in an instructive kind of self-examination. The constant question has been: "Do I do that?" Since so often the answer has been: "Yes, but it looks as if I shouldn't," there may be some general value in listing the challenged practices in question form, as a suggested check list for other teachers in the field.

1. Do I "over-help" the student by talking while he talks instead of letting him stumble through the sentence by himself?

The teacher should set the pattern and then listen, giving the student a chance to feel his way through the utterance without being goaded or drowned out by the over-helpful instructor who says it along with him.

2. After the student has haltingly achieved the phrase or sentence, has captured the forms and arranged them in proper order, do I let the matter drop without getting him to repeat the sentence with normal rhythm and intonation?

The teacher should regularly and systematically get the student to repeat the "pieced together" utterance with the rhythm and intonation that make it sound like English.

3. If I have distorted a sentence to emphasize a problem form or word order arrangement, do I neglect to repeat the sentence with normal

intonation before asking the students to imitate it?

If we are to practice intonation as well as preach it, each distorted sentence should be restored to its natural pitch and rhythm before it is presented for imitation.

4. Do I require students to use the full sentence (statement) pattern in situations where the short answer pattern would be more natural for a native speaker?

For example, the answer to "Where do you live?" is normally, "On Main Street," not "I live on Main Street."

5. In working with adult students, do I over-use juvenile situations? Are the students constantly required to talk about little Mary when they would rather be talking about Professor Adams and his colleagues? Do I show pictures of high school youngsters playing football to the exclusion of pictures about adult travelers buying plane tickets?

The patterns for adult beginners should be pared down to the simplest fundamentals; the situations in which these patterns are used need not, and must not, be infantile.

6. With adult professional people, do I over-use non-professional materials?

Since professional people are people, and since learning a language requires acquaintance with the total environment in which the language is used, much of the material will necessarily deal with food, family life and social activities. But there should be provision in every university English course for talk about examinations, course requirements, bibliographies, academic interviews, and other situations for which adult students want and need linguistic equipment. When students complain that "the course is too simple," they are sensing the lack of such mature academic material.

7. Do my example sentences lack situational continuity? In illustrating a pattern do I conjure out of the blue just any sentence which happens to combine the desired pattern with simple vocabulary?

If so, the result sounds something like this

Mr. Pratt is going to the bank.

I am going to the blackboard.

The students are going to the library.

Although these sentences have the virtue of demonstrating the pattern BE plus -ING and the function word, TO, they are too disjointed to communicate any unified situation into which the students may tie the pattern. More attention to continuity would produce such a

sequence as this:

Mr. Pratt is planning his afternoon.

He is going to the bank.

He is going to the post office.

He is going to the book store.

He is going to the barber shop.

He is going to a restaurant after that.

(His wife is going to a party this afternoon.)

8. Similarly, when my students practice the pattern, do I urge them to "Just give us a sentence--any sentence in the pattern"?

If I do this, I am ignoring the vital relationship between language and "practical events." I am cutting the linguistic form off from experience, which is the life-blood of language. As linguists we know that language acquires meaning only when and as it is used in a situation. As teachers we sometimes forget that a student should be saying something that has real meaning for him personally, not only after he has learned the pattern but also while he is learning it.

Thus if students are practicing the question pattern with WHERE, they should be encouraged to ask about things whose location they actually want to learn. They should not mention words at random merely to fill a blank in the substitution frame. For example

Teacher: When you go to Washington during your next vacation (or to another university after you finish this English course), you will want to find your way to many places. What questions will you ask, beginning with WHERE?

Students: Where is the bank?

Where is the airport?

Where is the best restaurant? etc.

The function of the teacher, in other words, is to set the stage for communication which has real-life meaning for the students, announce the rules of the game (i.e., the structural controls), and then keep stimulating students to use the problem patterns while saying something that they really want to say.

9. Do I insist on one thing and then reward my students for doing something else?

As English teachers we are continually (and properly) urging students to be accurate in the production of sounds, in the arrangement of words, and so on; yet as human beings we are less apt to reward students for accuracy than for wit, originality, or other more socially marketable qualities. This is inevitable unless we take pains to avoid it. In ordinary communication with our native-speaking associates, we do not go around complimenting people on the accuracy of their consonants or the appropriateness of their verb forms. Nor have our

students in their native-speaking past had occasion to find this kind of precision rewarding or even relevant. If we seriously wish (and of course we do) to have our students strive for an [æ] that sounds like [æ] even when [æ] is not the immediate target of practice, we ought to form the habit of rewarding successful attempts to be accurate, by signalling our approval.

10. Do I keep my students sitting around the black-board when they might more profitably be experiencing English out in the world, with me along to systematize the learning?

In many teaching centers classes are small enough to move out of the classroom occasionally, visiting the library, the post office, the bank, the railroad station. If careful preparation precedes the visit, if students and teacher know what they are looking and listening for, if the teacher has a slate and chalk, if the students have lap-boards on which to write while standing clustered around the teacher, if English only is the enforced rule, if fifteen minutes at the end of the class are spent in a quiet spot practicing the items which have been learned in action, the lesson can be both lively and systematic. And the context will have done much of the teaching.

The writer has found the listed questions useful aids to self-examination, and, more important, spurs to inventiveness. If the answer to "Do I do that?" is "Yes, but I shouldn't," what, then, should I be doing? Suggestion has been made of a few techniques which in this teacher's opinion seem more valid than the ones challenged above. Language Learning offers opportunities for the sharing of other procedures toward an on-going implementation of the principles established by linguistic research.

APPROACHING READING THROUGH THE NATIVE LANGUAGE

Eugene A. Nida

Summer Institute of Linguistics

For a number of years prior to 1936 it was the general policy of the educational authorities of Mexico to insist vigorously upon the exclusive use of Spanish in schools which were located among Indian populations. Repeated attempts were made to discourage the use of any one of the 51 Indian languages of Mexico, and for such a tribe as the Mayas, numbering some 300,000, it was officially prohibited to give instruction in the Mayan language. Publications in the native languages were discouraged, except for those few people who might have some scientific or antiquarian interest in the indigenous tongues. Normal school graduates who might know some Indian language were almost always transferred to another Indian area, so that there would be no possibility of their using the Indian language as a medium of education.

General policies were also supplemented by such supposedly practical measures as administering corporal punishment to any child who might be found speaking his native language at school. There was no mistaking the vigorous and thorough-going measures which were undertaken to force the use of Spanish on the Indian-speaking population.

Nevertheless, this program largely failed. In the first place, the school children returned from boarding schools back into their home communities, where the social and economic influence of Spanish-speaking people had not kept pace with the enforced school program. In a number of cases, the students practically gave up the use of what little Spanish they had been obliged to learn. Furthermore, there was practically no available and adequate literature in Spanish which held any interest for them, and hence, what slight facility they had gained in Spanish was almost entirely lost. But in addition to the general inadequacy of the linguistic medium a certain amount of antipathy developed among some Indian groups against Spanish. The introduction of Spanish in the schools had been unnatural. Where the presentation was purely mechanical, there was scarcely any appreciation, and where the presentation was with force, there was an inevitable reaction of resentment, especially among those stronger and more vigorous native leaders, as among the Tarahumaras, who opposed Spanish as the instrument of intrusion and aggression by the central government. Rather than accomplish the purposes of the educational authorities who had in all sincerity designed the language program, the plan had failed to make adequate inroads on the original problem and had at the same time created certain

strong opposition, which proved a further retarding influence.

About 1936 there was a distinct change in the government program. This resulted from a recognition of the failure of the previous approach and from an entirely different orientation toward the Indian and his future value to the national life. The general outlines of the new policy (though never officially formulated or published) included (1) primers and introductory books in the native languages, (2) the use of the native languages in the schools for giving instruction, especially in the lower grades (this meant allocating teachers to their own language areas or urging others to learn and use the native language of the region), (3) the encouragement of the production of diglot publications (these were especially produced by members of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, working in the country).

The principal values of the diglot primers (or rather, the introduction of the native language first and then the national language) were: (1) less initial discouragement because the student failed to understand the strange vocabulary, (2) greater interest, because the subject matter and linguistic medium were thoroughly familiar to him, (3) a natural, unprejudiced transition, since there was no attempt to disparage his own native tongue, but to use the "known" to lead him to the "unknown." Since the reading process began with his own language, he rapidly gained self-confidence, and his estimation of his own ability was enhanced. This made him all the more ready to undertake something more difficult. With self-confidence restored, many of the natives surprised the directors of the program by the avidity which they demonstrated toward learning.

For the success of such a program there are some technical requisites (not all of which have been perfectly carried out in the Mexican project): (1) well-developed, scientific primers, (2) properly adapted subject material in the primers, whether for children or adults, and (3) adequate supplementary material, whether of pre-primer or of post-primer types.

Primers must, of course, follow language usage, and principles of progression, repetition, review, and timing must be carefully adhered to. Content material should be designed to follow some theme, if possible, and should carry interest. This principle was carried out very nicely in the Aztec primer worked out by the Mexican department of education in collaboration with Mexican linguists. The theme centered about the various processes of planting, cultivating, and harvesting corn. Since this is the primary occupation of the people, both interest and knowledge were excellent. Furthermore, the transition to the Spanish vocabulary was also well planned.

One should not have any illusions about the motivation of such a program. The emphasis upon the Indian languages in Mexico was not dictated by any desire to perpetuate the indigenous languages. On the contrary, the particular approach was adopted because those with experience were convinced that by a proper emphasis upon the native languages it would be possible to supersede them more readily than would otherwise be the case. Enforced opposition only resulted in retreat and the erection of barriers against the effective penetration of Spanish. By the use of diglot primers and other supplementary literature in the native languages, these very languages were to be made the vehicles of transition to the national language.

The missions working in Mexico which cooperated with this same program were not motivated by any desire to preserve the native tongues. The program of the missionaries was likewise to be benefited by the ultimate linguistic unification of the country and the incorporation of the native communities into the larger life of the Spanish-speaking membership. In fact, by means of a properly balanced program everyone stood to gain: the government, by the building of a citizenry capable of effective intercommunication; the missions, by the closer integration and more effective extension of their work; the natives, by possessing a means of more rapid assimilation of the national language.

A rather similar situation has existed in Peru, though the change has not been so clearly defined by such an abrupt modification of policy. Nevertheless, it has been significant that recent educational commissions from the United States, which have been attempting to deal with this situation, have constantly placed emphasis upon the use of the native language as an effective instrument for transition. Rather than suppress Quechua or Aymara, they are utilizing this basic medium for more efficient and rapid transition to Spanish.

It is true that the orthographies employed in these circumstances have not been identical as between Spanish on the one hand and Quechua or Aymara on the other. The same is also true for the situation in Mexico. But despite such differences in orthography, the use of the indigenous language has been important for two reasons: (1) natives mastered the initial steps of reading, which are after all the most difficult, and (2) the mental stimulus which came from such activity created confidence and a certain amount of enthusiasm for further learning.

It is impossible to overemphasize the psychological importance of the first step in learning to read. Those of us who are constantly surrounded by pictures and signs

from our earliest childhood do not appreciate the problem of the illiterate native who has no comprehension of the significance of a symbolization such as letters imply. The fact that strange marks on a piece of paper actually convey "ideas" and especially "ideas" which he expresses verbally in his own language seems incredible. Once he understands that such symbols are not just marks but that they have meaning, he has conquered the most difficult problem of his learning process. Anyone who has had experience in teaching natives to read will recognize that the grasping of this essential value of symbolization is infinitely more easily taught if the symbolism reflects his own language rather than one which is unfamiliar, or perhaps only partially familiar to him. It is because of this basic problem that linguists and educators have combined to work out programs for developing the most effective transition techniques.

Before 1945 the United States education service responsible for educational work among the Navajos followed a somewhat similar program as was tried in Mexico before 1936. Children were punished for speaking Navajo during school hours or even in the dormitories. Content education through the Navajo medium was completely discouraged, and any attempt to use Navajo as a transition mechanism in the process of learning to read was generally frowned upon.

More progressive educational ideas, however, finally permeated the education department and as a result an experiment was conducted. A number of Navajo students were sent to Sherman Institute, an Indian school in Riverside, California. They were given content classes by Navajo instructors and in the Navajo language. The use of the Navajo language was not forbidden, but the students were encouraged to learn as much English as possible through contact with Indians of other tribes, who used English as their primary medium of communication. The Navajo students also studied English in class, but the methods were strictly functional and the entire approach was different from what had been the former practice.

By the end of the first year of the experiment it was found that the Navajo students had learned more English than any previous group upon whom English had been "forced." They had in addition acquired a great deal of knowledge through the content courses given in Navajo. But above everything else, these students were far better oriented as regards their social outlook than had been the case with previous groups. As a result of these outstanding successes the program has been considerably expanded, and a new attitude toward the possibilities of bilingual education has arisen.

To meet the needs of adult Navajos who do not know

English (not more than 10,000 out of an approximate 60,000 Navajos have a functional use of English), the government is putting out a Navajo newspaper, giving English summaries. This represents a kind of diglot educational process. The American Bible Society has cooperated in publishing a diglot Gospel of John, and other books in Navajo are now being published so as to reach the large adult population.

In Portuguese West Africa it has been the policy for a number of years to publish diglots. In fact, all books in native languages must by law occur with a Portuguese translation, either on facing pages or bound into the back of the book. It is probably unnecessary to go to this extreme of requiring all books to be so published, but there is no doubt about the validity of the principle of using a native language to help in the extension of the national language. In Angola the problem of illiteracy is still acute, but this is due primarily to the fact that adult literacy programs have been too inadequate and reading materials have been too limited. In some ways the enforcing of diglots, which are, of course, more expensive, tends to reduce the total amount of literature produced. Accordingly, a program of diglot publications requires the wholehearted cooperation and support of all those concerned with the problem.

Reports from Russia, even though they are fragmentary, and sometimes without adequate documentation, still give abundant evidence of the effectiveness of using the indigenous languages for the development of literacy, and the employment of such literacy methods to increase the use of the national language. Russia has attained an amazing political solidarity, part of which may be attributed to a progressive and realistic attitude toward the approximately fifty languages, reportedly employed more or less extensively in publications.

There are a number of other countries now faced with similar problems. India and Pakistan must develop some sound program for the use of national languages. Indonesia and Ethiopia must do the same under somewhat similar circumstances. Sooner or later countries such as Burma and Indo-China will be obliged to deal with such problems of developing a common medium of communication. It is hoped that some use will be made of the experience of other countries which have faced and are now solving their difficulties through an adequate emphasis on the native languages as transition instruments and through the employment of diglots, as one type of specific aid

CONTROLLED INFANT INTONATION

Evelyn G. Pike

Summer Institute of Linguistics

With the first words which she spoke, our daughter, Judith, used a rising intonation. Such an intonation is so common among small children that I have associated it with "baby talk."¹ The possibility of controlling our intonation in speaking with her didn't occur to me until Judith's intonation habits had become already well established; and this, much sooner than most of her other speech habits. I assume this to be because for some time small children tend to use a very limited number of intonation contours which are repeated on many different combinations of segmental items. My husband and I had already tried a similar approach, for Judith, as regards the segmental phonemes--the consonants and the vowels. We had deliberately avoided the use of words specially modified in their consonants and vowels so that the period during which she used "baby talk" seemed to us and a number of others to be considerably shorter than we have observed it to be in other children whose parents used special word forms in speaking to the children. Therefore, with our second daughter, Barbara, I determined to try a type of controlled intonation designed to eliminate from her speech the intonation of "baby talk".

The rising intonation that Judith used seemed to correspond to the 2-1 or 3-1² contour of adults. Thus she would say, with that rise, Dog? Dog? or Horse? Horse? or Flower? Flower? (With strong phonetic modifications, such as [ho¹ɪs] for horse, and [səu] for flower.)

¹"Baby talk" in this sense is used as applying to the phonetically modified forms the child says in his effort to repeat the normal speech that he hears from his elders. Among other varieties of baby talk is that which children use because they hear forms spoken by their elders deliberately modified to mimic the children.

²For an analysis of American intonation, see Kenneth L. Pike, Intonation of American English, University of Michigan Publications in Linguistics I, (Ann Arbor: University of Mich. Press, 1945). As indicated there, American English intonation contours are best described in terms of four relative heights at which the intonations begin and end. These may be symbolized by the numbers 1, 2, 3, and 4, with 1 as the highest pitch and 4 as the lowest.

Judith was not the only person who used this intonation for these isolated words. Both her father and I, and all the neighbors, in trying to get Judith to talk would point to objects, name them, and pronounce the name with a rising 2-1 or 3-1 intonation. The reason for this seemed to be that the speakers' attitudes in saying, Baby while pointing to a doll, for example, included the meanings: Do you want the baby? or Can you say the word baby? or Do you understand the word baby? These attitudes tended to force the speakers to use a rising intonation. Now in adult conversation, the question might be asked this same way, but the response Yes, or No, would usually be given with a falling pitch. Judith, however, instead of using the intonation normal for the response, merely mimicked the intonation which she heard.³

Our living situation at the time Barbara was ready to learn to speak made the intonation experiment possible. We had no near English speaking neighbors, but mostly Aztecs and Mixtecos. Judith was in school during most of Barbara's waking hours, and my husband was away, so I could control all direct English which she heard; later, upon my husband's return, he joined in controlling the speech which Barbara heard.

First, I wished to obtain the intonation falling from pitch 2 to 4, a contour normal to English, as a response to the question Do you understand that this is a baby? Assuming that the child would mimic my own pitch contours, I controlled my speech by using a 2-4 falling intonation. That is, instead of pointing to a doll and saying, Baby? with a rising intonation, I would say it with a falling one. Rather than implying Do you understand that this is a baby? I said, Baby! and implied, This is a baby, or Here is a baby. In repeating the same word several times in succession with the first syllable

³I was interested to observe children's speech in Mixteco village of San Miguel el Grande, Oaxaca, Mexico. They also repeat the pitch of the voice used in speaking directly to them. One of the first two words spoken by a child who visited our home frequently were [táa] 'father' and [côʔo] 'let's go'. In each word there was a falling pitch comprised of a high tone followed by a low tone. This was the correct pitch sequence as used by the parents and is not altered by the attitude of the speaker nor is it changed in questions; the pitch is lexical. Thus, from the beginning, the pitch of the child's voice for these words was normal Mixteco. Little children learn lexical tone as they learn segmental items of their language.

on pitch 2 and the second on pitch 4, I used the falling intonation on the word each time it was uttered even though in normal spoken English such a sequence might induce a rise on all pronunciations of the word but the last.

Baby was, therefore, the first word Barbara spoke. Much of the time she pronounced the vowel of the second syllable differently from the vowel of the first syllable, so that this word deliberately given by Barbara could be distinguished readily from nonsense chatter in which the vowels of all the syllables tended to be identical for any one specific sequence but might vary from sequence to sequence. During the first week that she began to use this word, Barbara used only a falling intonation, or occasionally a level one; she did not use rising intonation at all. She would point to her dolls, or pat herself, and say Baby with a falling intonation roughly equivalent to the one I had used in speaking to her.

About the same time I was trying to teach her a new word and a different intonation. The word chosen was Daddy! and the intonation was that of a call; the first syllable was long and extra-high, on pitch one, and the second was somewhat long and on pitch 2 or 3. In one room with Barbara I would call and point toward the other room, where my husband was staying out of sight. He would then answer. After some days, Barbara one day called out, in the same intonation, when my husband was in the next room and I was not with her; she seemed very gratified when she heard him respond. However, this intonation she did not use much after that, nor did we use it much in speaking to her.

With the same word but a different intonation--a contour falling from 3 to 4 or from 2 to 4--I then started teaching her to associate her father, mother, sister, and herself with their names and point to them when they were mentioned. She soon learned to say Daddy in this lower (and quieter) general pitch of the voice. She also learned to pat herself and say Baby in that intonation. Instead of learning to say Judy and Mommy, however, she extended the term Daddy to all three or to anyone else who seemed to give her pleasure. In each case she would use the falling intonation.

After she was using both words well, I had to leave Barbara with another American family. These people had not been told of the experiment which I was conducting, so naturally enough made no attempt to control their intonation, but used the rising intonation on the word Baby. When we returned after about four days absence, Barbara had largely stopped using the falling intonation and had substituted a rising one on Baby. With the word

Daddy, which the neighbors had not had occasion to use, Barbara continued to use the falling intonation. As we again began to use the falling intonation on the word Baby, Barbara began to use that intonation also, but never stopped using the rising one frequently.

This little experiment indicated to me that children mimic pitch very early; that those used by their elders spoken directly to them are the ones they learn first; that if the child's speech is to have the normal English intonation, those who work with him must modify their intonation to conform to that which is normal for the kind of responses that the child is learning to make.

WHITHER THE DESK DICTIONARY?

Albert H. Marckwardt

University of Michigan

For a number of reasons an exaggerated reverence for the dictionary has always constituted an important aspect of North American culture. This has had some unfortunate consequences, notably a timidity in, and the preservation of an authoritarian attitude toward, matters of language. On the credit side, our willingness to buy dictionaries has made the compilation and publication of them a profitable business; as a consequence, American initiative has given the consumer far better dictionaries for less money than can be purchased in any other country.

Again, however, the fact that dictionaries must be commercially profitable has resulted in certain unfortunate emphases. An undue amount of stress has been placed upon their prescriptive rather than their descriptive functions. Much material not strictly the business of the lexicographer has come to be included in them. Most striking of all, within recent years, has been the tremendous increase in the size of the dictionary. Within the last seventy-five years, the volume intended for handy desk or table reference has swollen from a modest two or three hundred pages to somewhere between twelve and fourteen hundred, necessitating at times the use of paper too thin to be serviceable. The volume has increased in size and thickness until today, if desk dictionary is still to be considered the appropriate term, the volume belongs with Biedermann furniture; it certainly does not match an *escritoire*. Desk dictionaries today have nearly one-fourth as many entries as the unabridged Webster or the Oxford.

It has already been suggested that this increase in size is due primarily to commercial competition rather than to a careful attempt to meet the precise needs of consumer. Charts, illustrations, the total number of entries all make good advertising copy and sales talk. As a consequence, every new entrant in the field must meet the challenge of its predecessors with more charts, more illustrations, and a larger number of entries. To this the latest comer, the G. & C. Merriam Company's Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary is no exception. It had to equal or surpass the previous records established by the American College Dictionary, which made a profound impression upon its appearance approximately sixteen months ago. Naturally this invites a comparison between these lexicographical leviathans, since for the next several years they are likely to be the two chief competitors in a field of five. Of the remaining three, the Macmillan

Modern Dictionary may be dismissed as negligible, the Winston and the Funk and Wagnalls' New College Standard Dictionary remaining well behind the leaders despite certain noteworthy features in each, particularly the last named

In an excellent article written just before the release of the Webster NCD, James B. McMillan¹ established as a framework for such a comparison one which may well suit our present purpose. He suggested an evaluation of "(1) the quantity of information, (2) the quality of the information, and (3) the effectiveness of presentation."

The quantity of information suggests first of all the total number of entries. Both dictionaries, of course, extend far beyond what may be called the ordinary potential of use. I open the pages of one at random and find gaberlunzie; I turn to the other and learn that Pietermaritzburg had 63,162 inhabitants in 1946. I could survive the omission of both items with ease. I mention this because not infrequently the buying public regards gross figures with far too much respect, if not awe. The fact that ACD has 188 entries from poem to politics as compared with 132 for NCD moves me not a whit; part of this is due to ACD's sensible inclusion of biographical material and place names within a single alphabetical arrangement -- a real point of superiority -- the rest of it arises merely from differences in editorial policy with respect to separate entries for compounds, derivatives, and various part-of-speech functions of the same word.

So far as new or current words are concerned, there is again little to choose: both include existentialism, frequency modulation, and sulfathiazol; both missed the obvious by neglecting coffee table and cookout. The sixteen months which have elapsed since the appearance of ACD gives its competitor a slight edge on the inclusion of names and places which have recently become important. NCD was able to gather in such items as Georgi Dimitrov, E. C. A., and Israel as the name for the present Jewish state. On this point, however, Professor McMillan's comment is pertinent and happily put -- "No desk dictionary attempts to compete with the annual world almanacs and encyclopedia yearbooks, and none should."² Other quantitative aspects tend to cancel each other out. NCD lists more foreign words and phrases, geographical names and biographical entries, but ACD has more illustrations and charts, and gives as main entries more common phrases

¹"Five College Dictionaries," College English 10 (1949) 214-221.

²Italics mine.

and literary titles. But these matters are incidental and of only minor significance.

Qualitative aspects of the dictionaries are discussed by Professor McMillan under such divisions as accuracy in reflecting present-day variations in pronunciation, use of recent scholarship in etymological treatments, skill in the employment of usage labels, and the accuracy and clarity of definitions. With respect to the first of these, the superiority of the ACD over its four competitors in the field, including the earlier Webster Collegiate is now no longer evident. Of twenty test words, variant pronunciations of which are often ignored by lexicographers, ACD has all the pertinent data on nineteen, and NCD on eighteen.³ So far as etymology is concerned, each dictionary had its expert, and where they differ it would appear to be a case of accepting the opinion of Malone as opposed to that of Bender, or vice versa, the only point being that the former for the ACD performed his task two years ago, whereas Bender for the NCD worked in the late 'twenties and early 'thirties. In general, words of moot etymology are relatively few in number, nor should we expect original contributions in this field from a dictionary. All that can reasonably be required is that it keep up with current scholarship. In this respect, ACD has somewhat the better record; NCD does not show the same evidences of revision in accordance with recent changes of opinion, often appearing to be content to rest upon the work done for the New International.

In the use of labels, too, ACD seems to be more precise and in somewhat greater accord with present usage, although here both dictionaries leave much to be desired. NCD still characterizes movie as slang, and like the ACD tycoon as colloquial, though certainly one is justified in wondering if this word is really used in informal spoken language. NCD labels the substantive plug in the sense of advertisement as "cant or colloquial," certainly confusing to the reader. In the matter of geographical labels the record of both dictionaries is only mediocre, though here again ACD has a decided edge. In it one at least may learn that assurance 'insurance,' lorry, and napkin 'diaper' are British, but the corres-

³The twenty words are: adult, altimeter, apparatus, carrousel, cerebral, chassis, contemplative, exema, exit, exquisite, finance, inhibition, kilometer, lever, margarine, Nevada, precedence, program, quintuplet, and senile. Of these NCD misses the pronunciation of inhibition without h, and both neglect the pronunciation of senile with the vowel of let.

ponding American terms are not labelled U.S. In both dictionaries the reader may discover that cowcatcher is employed in this country, but he will continue in the dark as to the corresponding British term. In neither dictionary is the British use of leader 'editorial' or oddmoment so labelled.

Dialect ascriptions within the United States are equally unsatisfactory. Both do characterize gallery as Southern, neither records lug as a bulk measure, ACD labels tunnel for funnel as dialect, but without indication of the region where it is employed, whereas NCD records the meaning only, with no indication of its regional status. Neither dictionary records rareripe nor indicates the regional use of scallion. To this reader at least, matters such as these are more important than the location of Kalamazoo or indicating the existence of such a combined form as scalpulovertebral.

There appears also to be a fairly sharp division between the two dictionaries with respect to the technique of definition. ACD is more likely to attempt to define through illustration, employing the words in question in sentences or illustrative phrases. NCD definitions are at times more compactly written, which may represent a gain in actual content in terms of the space employed for them, but occasionally this also involves a sacrifice in ease of comprehension. This same general difference in treatment holds true for the synonymy; NCD gives more synonyms, treats them more compactly. ACD proceeds in a more leisurely fashion and again tends to discriminate through illustration. Which technique is preferable is at present largely a matter of the taste of the consumer, which is more effective can be determined perhaps only through controlled experiments.

In arrangement and presentation of material, ACD is still the innovator, with definitions arranged in order of frequency, the etymology placed at the end of the treatment, and the single alphabetical order of entries. The last of these is clearly advantageous. The case for the other two is based upon the assumption that the average user does not look for a concept of semantic development when he consults a desk dictionary, but as these volumes grow in size, this assumption is less likely to be valid. The most radical change in NCD is the transfer of the running pronunciation key from the bottom of each page to the end papers. I prophesy that this will cause considerable criticism, largely because the limitations of this key are not apparent to the average user. Looked at from the long range or evolutionary lexicographical point of view, this is probably not a bad thing, but it also illustrates the straits to which competition for total inclusions will drive dictionary publishers.

NCD still has its excellent Guide to Pronunciation with the system of references to it throughout the text, an argument in its favor which in my view will compensate for any three or four other shortcomings which have been noted, although the use of the schwa symbol by ACD is almost as strong a counter-argument.

All in all both are good dictionaries, both have their weaknesses and their strong points, but one cannot help asking whether we have not reached the ultimate in size. Can these volumes become even larger and more cumbersome? Are not these dictionaries written too much from the point of view of the crossword puzzle fan and to satisfy the naive expectation that any single-volume work can serve as a source of knowledge in all fields? Is it not time, perhaps, that the desk dictionary be returned to the English language? It was originally an abridgement of a large work. If the so-called abridgement grows much larger than the present volumes, we may next expect that some keen and sensitive entrepreneur will present us with an abridgement of an abridgement.

REVIEWS

Chao, Yuen Ren. Mandarin Primer, an Intensive Course in Spoken Chinese. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Harvard University Press, 1948. viii +336 pp.

Mandarin Primer by Y.R. Chao, like most of the works by the same author, contains more than the title indicates. Although it is primarily a textbook to help beginners learn to speak Mandarin, it is also a standard book for those who are interested in the linguistic aspects of the Chinese language and those whose interest is in a method of teaching a foreign language.

In Mandarin Primer, Mr. Chao solves numerous problems which have been puzzling many a linguist. Anyone who wishes to be informed of the sound system of Mandarin will find a detailed descriptive analysis of pronunciation and romanization. A large portion of the material may be found in the first part of the introduction to Concise Dictionary of Spoken Chinese by the same author. However, Mr. Chao has added individual descriptions for each of the sounds in the sound system of Mandarin. Besides numerous other details, he has made the chart "Finals in All Tones (Memorize!)" and that for "Retrosive Finals in All Tones" more complete than those in the Dictionary. Even though one can find the rest of the material on pronunciation in the Dictionary, one will find that a re-reading of the analysis will solve many of the pronunciation problems involved.

In the treatment of grammar, Mr. Chao stresses the fact that grammatical features in one language do not

necessarily correspond to the grammatical features of another language. He illustrates this point by devoting a whole section to comparing Chinese with English. Besides, the way Chinese grammar is taken up here is according to the modern linguistic method. It covers Words, Sentences, Syntax, Morphology, Compounds, etc. Yet it is not necessary to have a firm linguistic background before one can understand the subject.

Needless to say, Mr. Chao, the linguist-teacher, also explains the how and why concerning the method of study he suggests in this book: that vocabulary should be taught through context, that structure should be explained in English and mastered through practice, that the echoing system should be used, and that informants are more satisfactory than phonograph records.

For those who are especially interested in Chinese characters, Mr. Chao has described in detail the kinds of characters, how to look up characters in a Chinese dictionary, and why, in writing characters, a definite order for the strokes must be followed. There are also examples showing that even the written forms have changed in the last few thousand years.

Besides all these features, Mr. Chao also gives a short discussion on sound changes of Chinese through its long history, a concise section on the geographical distribution of the families of dialect within the vast area of China, an account of the adoption of Mandarin as the national language, and a summary of the various attempts to romanize Mandarin. Although Mr. Chao aims to teach Mandarin in this book, he also explains that wenli is -- a term applied to the literary language by Western writers on Chinese -- and calls attention to the important role wenli plays as a record of Chinese literature. "Wenli is not an additional dialect, for it has no pronunciation of its own. The same sentence in wenli has as many ways of pronunciation as there are dialects. The vast body of Chinese literature is in wenli. The amount of existing colloquial literature in the dialects is negligible." (p.8) In other words, China uses one consistent set of graphic representations, though such representations have different pronunciations according to the dialect.

A group of twenty-eight lessons constitutes the main section of the book. The first four lessons deal with tones, difficult sounds, the system of sounds, and the system of tone sandhi. Mr. Chao believes that "Conscientious work at this phonetic stage will result in great ease in subsequent command of the language material in grammar, vocabulary, and idiom." (p.84) and he calls these lessons "Foundation Work." The remaining twenty-

four lessons are conversational lessons. With each lesson there are English equivalents. At the end of each lesson there are notes in which grammar is explained and exercises without answers for the students. (See the review to Character Text following this review.)

Mandarin Primer is a textbook written according to the modern linguistic method of teaching a foreign language. With aptly chosen examples and analogies Mr. Chao sets forth the chief features of the method, so that the book is of interest and value to anyone interested in learning, knowing, or teaching a foreign language -- not merely to the student of Chinese. Every reader who knows Mr. Chao can hear him talk with his genuine Chinese humor sprinkled all through the lessons. It is also a standard reference on the Chinese language which every linguist should have on his shelf. Above all, for those, Chinese or otherwise, who have been saying and who are still saying that there is no grammar in Chinese, Mandarin Primer corrects a grievous error. Yao Shen, University of Michigan

Chao, Yuen Ren. Character Text for Mandarin Primer. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Harvard University Press, 1948. 142 pp.

In the Character Text for Mandarin Primer, Professor Chao achieves two purposes. First, he opens the door with a broad smile of confidence to anyone, linguist or otherwise, who would like to learn to read and to write Chinese, but who has unfortunately been impressed by the prevalent mistaken idea of the difficulties involved. Second, anyone who wishes only to recognize the Chinese characters given in Mandarin Primer will find them all in the Character Text.

Those who have only the second aim will find in the first part of Character Text all the Chinese words in the introduction to Mandarin Primer. Each entry is given with reference to the number of the chapter and that of the section. In certain places, Mr. Chao even gives the number of the paragraph. Every word in the four lessons in "Foundation Work" and the twenty-four conversational lessons is given in characters. Exercises at the end of each lesson in Mandarin Primer are grouped together with answers in cursive writing. Such answers, as Mr. Chao said, are for the Chinese teacher and the English-speaking students who can read cursive characters.

Those who have the first aim will find that at the end of the text, there is a list of characters prepared especially for them. Each character is divided into parts, if any. The part that is to be written first is given first. Following each part are the various strokes in the order to be written. As the students go along

finishing one stroke after another, they will find Mr. Chao, the patient Chinese teacher, after the standard set by Confucius, has been leading them forward quietly one step after another until they arrive at the final stroke and the character is done.

However, students who are anxious to learn to read and to write Chinese, should remember that, although Character Text is the companion book to Mandarin Primer, Mr. Chao advises them to use Character Text after they are fairly acquainted with Mandarin Primer orally. In other words, Mr. Chao advocates the principle: learn to speak first, then to read, finally to write.

Hall, Robert A. Jr. Leave Your Language Alone! Ithaca, New York: Division of Modern Languages, Cornell University, 1948. 163 pp.

Leave Your Language Alone! is divided into the following sections: Part I, Things We Worry About; Part II, How Language is Built; Part III, Language in the World Around Us, (This section covers Linguistic Geography, Meaning, and Change); Part IV, What Can We Do About Language; Appendix A, Some Useful Books; Appendix B, Phonetic Symbols.

This book attempts to dispel the schizophrenia that the ordinary speaker labors under, namely, what he himself says and what he thinks "should" be said. The finger-shaking title sets the tone for a large part of the book. In vigorous terms the author tries to jolt the public out of its inferiority complex toward its own use of language. Certain time-worn bogies as to what is correct and incorrect are attacked.

The novelty of the book lies in the fact that its basis is spoken language, and not the written rules that have come down intact and unchanged over a long period of time.

In the attempt to introduce objectivity and perspective in the reader's thinking, the author discusses features of foreign and little known languages. The reader is shown that what is socially acceptable or unacceptable is arbitrary and constantly changing, that it applies to one particular time and place and not to another, and that it is idle to classify languages as to inherent value or merit.

After his initial blast at the language worrier and the people and ideas that have made him what he is today, the author brings in the facts of language and the findings of modern linguistic science, taking up in some detail phonology, morphology, syntax, meaning, borrowing, change, and other matters.

It is questionable how much the reader untrained in linguistic science will get out of the more technical passages. He will certainly be jolted out of believing some of the myths about language. At the same time he has the assurance that if he stops, looks around, and listens, he can determine for himself what is right or wrong with his usage, and that in so doing he will be in step with modern linguistic science.

This little book is valuable because it combines the unemotional, scientific presentation of the facts of language with a warm, informal appeal of the type that induces people to wake up and live, or to begin their life at forty.

Angela Paratore
Cornell University

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND NOTES

We have received the following information about summer orientation and English instruction centers for foreign students. The programs listed are for 1949:

Bucknell University.....	Summer Session (6 or 8 weeks)
Colorado School of Mines.....	May 13-Sept. 9
Louisiana State University.....	6 weeks late summer
Mills College.....	6 weeks beginning July 7
Queens College.....	Summer Session (June 6-August 26)
Springfield College.....	Regular Session
Teachers College, Columbia University.....	Regular and Summer Session
University of California.....	Regular and Summer Session (Aug. 2-Sept. 11)
University of California (L.A.).....	Regular and Summer Session (June 25-Aug. 15)
University of Denver.....	Regular and Summer Session
University of Michigan.....	Continuous
University of Oklahoma.....	Regular Session
University of Southern California.....	Regular Sessions
Vassar College.....	Regular Session
Wellesley College.....	Special Summer Center (Aug. 30-Sept. 10)
Washington Orientation Center, Wash., D.C.....	Continuous

* * * * *

The Linguistic Institute of the Linguistic Society of America will be held at the University of Michigan from June 25 to August 12.

READERS' EXCHANGE

Dear Sirs:

Won't you please page straight through a volume instead of issue by issue?

Dept. of English
Univ. of Washington
Seattle 5, Washington

Yours truly,
P.G. Perrin

Language Learning endorses Professor Perrin's suggestion. Starting with this issue the magazine will be numbered by volume rather than by issue.

To our readers:

Language Learning is now beginning its second year. Like many new publications, it has had to struggle to survive. But because we believe in the need for such a journal, we have done our best to provide it. This issue appears in a new gray cover, which offers better readability. Our printing has been changed to cut our operating costs. We begin our second year in the hope that we will continue to deserve the steady support of our subscribers.

Copyright 1949

by

Charles C. Fries, David W. Reed,
and Betty Jane Wallace

The subscription price for Language Learning is two dollars (\$2.00) per calendar year (four issues). Correspondence regarding subscriptions should be addressed to Language Learning, 1522 Rackham Building, Ann Arbor, Michigan. Foreign readers may address correspondence to one of our representatives listed opposite page 1 of this issue.

